UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,304	04/28/2006	Hideaki Fujita	65472 (70868)	8038
21874 7590 01/09/2009 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 55874			WONG, TINA MEI SENG	
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2874	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/577,304	FUJITA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	TINA M. WONG	2874					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Se	entember 2008						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>							
ologica in absordance with the practice ander E	x parte gadyle, 1000 O.B. 11, 40	0 0.0. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) 22 is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	· · · <u> </u>						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	•						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 April 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		, ,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 LLS C & 110(a)	-(d) or (f)					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 0.5.6. § 119(a)	-(u) or (i).					
·— <u> </u>	s have been received						
	• •						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
God the attached actained emice action for a list of	or the contined deplet het receive	.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)						

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is responsive to Applicant's response submitted 12 September 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minamio et al. (U.S. Patent 6,864,117) in view of Fukasawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,082).

Regarding claims 1-5, 15, 16 and 19-21, Minamio et al. discloses an optical element sealing structure comprising a mounting body 3/1 provided with a light transmitting section through which light traveling along a predetermined optical path passes; an optical element (e.g. CCD) 4 having an optical surface which is directed to the light transmitting section, and is mounted such that the optical element blocks the light transmitting section at one end; and a sealing body 6 that is formed in a region excluding the optical path, and seals the optical element mounted on the mounting body. The sealing body is formed in a region of the optical element opposite (i.e. facing) to the mounting body. Note transmitting body 5, lead frame 3 and sub mount 4 wherein the optical element is mounted on the lead frame via the sub mount. The exterior terminal portions 3b are exposed to the atmosphere around the sealing structure. The base 1 permits the sealing structure to be optically coupled with a light-transmitting medium (e.g. lens), thereby constituting an optical coupler.

Art Unit: 2874

But, Minamio et al. does not expressly disclose the sealing body to be made of molding resin. However, Fukasawa et al. discloses a similar device comprising a sealing body 38 that is made of a molding resin and is formed by molding. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a sealing body made of molding resin to enable complete protective encapsulation of the optical element while maintaining desired device thickness. Furthermore it is noted that the manner in which a device is made is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Furthermore, although not expressly disclosed, increasing environmental resistance of the sealing body, providing a connection body with wires for establishing electrical connections, and matching linear expansion coefficients of the materials in the structure would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for reducing noise, relaxing alignment tolerances, and for improving structural longevity, respectively.

Regarding claims 6-9, the selection of any well known material would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the desired characteristics of the components.

Furthermore, Figure 1 discloses the claimed contact areas, wherein the sealing body and the mounting body are covered with the transmitting body (i.e. the transmitting body is disposed over the sealing body and the mounting body).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, although not expressly disclose, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to secure the transmitting body to the mounting body using an adhesive for improving structural integrity. A light-transmitting adhesive having a refractive index higher than that of air and filled between the optical surfaces would also have been obvious for providing an index-matched medium within the optical path for reducing losses.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, positioning section 9 has a stepped taper wherein the diameter is reduced toward the light-receiving surface of the optical element (column 5, lines 4-26).

Regarding claim 14, the attachment area between the transmitting body and the sealing body is smaller than the surface area on a side where the sealing body is in contact with the mounting body as seen in Figure 1.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Minamio et al. discloses an aperture but does not disclose the claimed direction of taper (Figure 6). However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the reverse taper for a light emitting device, whereas the taper shown for Minamio et al. is for a light-receiving device, in order to optimize the coupling of light propagating in the reverse direction.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 22 is allowed for the reasons stated in the previous Office action, mailed 28 December 2008.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the sealing resin of Minamio et al does not equate and is structurally different to the sealing body of the present invention. However, the argument does not reflect the claim language. Although the Minamio et al reference's sealing resin does have different structural characteristics, the claim language only requires the sealing body to be formed in a

Art Unit: 2874

region excluding the optical path and seals the optical element mounted on the mounting body.

As explained in the rejection above, Minamio et al meets the requirements of the claim language.

Applicant also argues the thermal conductivity of the Minamio et al reference can not perform the same function as the present invention. Again, this argument does not reflect the claim language. The claim language only requires for the sealing body to have a thermal conductivity. Furthermore, every component inherently has a thermal conductivity, even if the thermal conductivity of the component is zero. Therefore, the Minamio et al reference meets the requirements of the claim limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TINA M. WONG whose telephone number is (571)272-2352. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/577,304 Page 6

Art Unit: 2874

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Uyen-Chau Le can be reached on (571) 272-2397. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tina M Wong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2874